

Better psychology tests benefit the finding of the genetics at: science of psychology measured traits (I perceive trait means: anything the test is measuring), better psychology tests then subsequently benefit finding genes and alleles and making new genes and alleles for genetically enhanced modified germlines at both women and men

better psychology tests also increase trait inheritability at genetically enhanced sperm

It is likely there is already science of psychology literature on it but I think it is possible to have a reapplicable independent measure (separately testable) of trait stability. For example at the myers briggs, which has been discredited for having too low test-retest similarity, it is possible there is a subgroup of myers briggs test takers who have very high test-retest similarity and that they can somehow be predicted with another different test,

I like the myers Briggs psychology test, and think it can be made into a test that would satisfy a science of psychology, numerically capable and fluent, psychology professional. a new Myers-Briggs test can have 5 character designations like ENTP1 (ENTP1-4) where 4 is greatest amount of 1 and 5 year test retest identity, and the myers briggs with number then passes tests of validity to be a legitimate personality measuring instrument, while ENTP3 and ENTP4 would let the person thinking about being an ENTP know their score was without scientific validity but gave them fun things to think about, but that personality descriptor was a group trend then might not endure through a 1 year and 5 year retest; there is a variation on this, At a version of the Myers briggs where, based on new questions, perhaps two out of 4 characteristics do have high five year test retest validity and two do not, introducing 8 new letters could solve this, if an ENTP is only at 5 year test-retest validity an ET, and the fantastic substitute letters for N and P are Q and R, and the substitute letters for S and J are Z and K then the ET person becomes EQTR; people can still get use out of it, but it emphasizes areas of enduring and also ephemeral ways of being and says which is which

Big 5 neuroticism may be partially predictive of less test-retest validity, as they may feel sometimes feel insecure, it also seems like any one of the questions on the test could cause what I perceive as unreliability; is possible high neuroticism scorers are insecure as to the specific subject the test is about, regardless of what is being tested;

A source of test-retest validity variance at psychological instruments (psychology tests) might be, as Sundet measured (1988) at a study of 40,000 Norwegian twins, the year of conception at a 7 year cycle, this goes with measured IQ varying between .87 and .27 variation as to heritability; I describe technologies to omit the Sundet cycle, making using genetically enhanced and optimized sperm to create children work better

Genetic technology: Independence from the Sundet cycle could be accomplished by genetically engineering people to make a peptide or protein that, with further research, is found to hold peak heritability of the sundet cycle; does the sundet cycle happen with yeast, c elegans, zebrafish, and mice as well as people, where it was originally measured? If it does is the period the same 7 years, or is it a sped up, like a “mouse time” (33 times faster) version of the Sundet cycle? If yeast get the sundet cycle then the full genome characterization over every mRNA profile, and sundet cycle varying or nonvarying phenotypic variation in buds (which are clones), as well as directed breeding and partners during yeast sexual reproduction can be used to find out which genes at humans could (perhaps do) effect the sundet cycle, optimally **making it so people are permanently at the highest heritability part of the sundet cycle to benefit homo sapiens’ that is people’s that is humans’ genetic enhancement and optimization**; to do this, at mice and humans the sundet cycle could be a basis for characterizing the difference, or lack of difference amongst monozygotic twins depending on cycle peaks and valleys; if monozygotic twins are highly similar, including psychology test measures like personality and intelligence, Light Triad, and sexual avidity tests regardless of their timing at the sundet cycle then that supports genetic

determinacy of personality and intelligence and Light Triad, if however the monozygotic twins are the (math of psychology meaning of the .27 to .87 difference) times as math divergent from each other on things like intelligence and personality when born at the most “minimize psychology test correlation” part of the Sundet cycle ( the .27 time compared with the .87 time for IQ) then that suggests that an additional beneficial to humans’, that is homo sapiens’ that is people’s germline is maximum sundet cycle heritability effect based on new genetics, or even made higher, as once the sundet cycle is comprehended and technologized raising the correlation or math to .99 ( 98-99%) has high benefit to humans and utility; At a different study the peak heritability of g I read about was .94, so .99 is just a little advanced of that; utilizing this new genetic sundet-cycle-resistance gene, allele, or multigene permanentized epigenetics, accompanying other Genetic optimization or genetic enhancement causes the genetic enhancement and genetic optimization to be more effective and as genetic enhancement and also genetic optimization are beneficial and good for homo sapiens, people, that is humans there is benefit

It is beneficial to modify the homo sapiens, that is humans that is peoples genomes globally to have a sundet cycle (what I call the sundet cycle, based on Sundet’s 1988 paper on IQ heritability in Norwegian twins) heritability number of .99, noting that at 1988, susceptibility to the sundet cycle was measured as going as high as .87; it is beneficial and supportive of all beneficial genetic enhancement to make sundet cycle heritability .99

sundet twin years, biological samples; During 2020AD twin registries for twin studies included more than 144,000 twins globally, dividing twins into year (or even month) of birth it is possible to construct and verify the sundet cycle on a new dataset with fresh twins born during 2020 and earlier, this can verify the sundet study as well as provide an up to date guide as to where people in 2020 are as far as the their nearness to peaks and valleys of the sundet effect, this makes it so people can, for example, time a pregnancy with sperm bank sperm from 99th

percentile of intelligence and height and other personality traits from a sperm bank, like the popular during 2020 Danish sperm banks; Some twin registries, like the UK twin registry have collected biological samples from twin volunteers including blood giving the ability to see if the Sundet effect applies to physiology and health as well;

if it works at sundet .23 it seems likely to work at sundet .87 as well; When creating an enhanced genome component like more BDNF at the CNS, if it works (its germline inheritance increases intelligence in a series of generations) at sundet cycle .27 heritability periods, then it likely continues to work, or works better at .87 sundet heritability periods; Current up to the year periods are calculable from twin registries' psychological tests, and the opportunity to give new psychological and physiological tests to twin volunteers

A thing I noticed about the Sundet cycle is that it only effects part of IQ, to my uncalculated perception, 20%, Like I perceive the 40.000 norwegian twins studied to find the cycle all learned to read for example; another thing they could do looking again at the 40,000 twins of the Sundet study (or from fresh data at the 2020 over 144,000 twins in twin registeries) is to find out if the .27 years had IQ that clustered nearer the middle of a normal distribution and if the .87 years had a wider distribution; this is beneficial as having a child during the .87 period is more likely to cause difference from the mean, loosely translated as greater individual difference and a more unique personality, which some people may value

Useful thing: the online survey twin registry, there are over 120 million twinned persons globally, and among the 4 billion that have internet capable phones there are about 60 million individual twins, using the internet it is possible to reach some of these twins and administer psychology tests, and requests for cheek swab samples (a way to find full genome data, which can also be used for characterizing some (73% of epigenetic similarity between cheek swab and other body tissues is a figure I read)

epigenetics), if one out of every 1000 individuals, from both individuals at a twin pairs both participate, then that is It is 60,000 twins available for online study and requests for paid cheek swab samples; it is possible to advertise to twins through text processing of social networking sites where people use phrases like “my identical twin sister”, or “my twin sister” triggering the placement of a twin registry advertisement. “Are you a twin? Get together and get 30 bucks each!” (\$30 2020AD USA \$) that is \$15 for a cheek swab and the other \$15 for say 3-7 hours of psychological tests spread over a month, and optimally 1 and 5 year re-takes of the tests; Twins should be paid incrementally, \$15 for the cheek swab and \$5 per completed online testing session (of variable time), with \$30 as a minimum figure; more \$ can be utilized, some twin pairs may be willing to take a lot of psychology tests; Note, this \$ differs from employment, which has other aspects, it is slightly like volunteering but with the appetizing positive reinforcement of a small amount of money to keep people interested and the money just causes greater participation and avidity; some technologists and researchers may even prefer to avoid paying people to get a different kind of sample

### Making psychology instruments (psychology tests)

The people at any test (psychological or physiological) that have 1 year and 5 year high retest identity, regardless of their year of birth (ruling out or at least decreasing Sundet cycle effects) may have genetics of the trait that are especially deterministic, they could even do high N (number of participants) internet surveys and find people that will put up with being surveyed every 6 months for five years; Also, a thing easy to appreciate, people that have the highest test-retest identity at science of psychology: happiness, subjective well being (SWB) are likely to have more deterministic, directive beneficial genetics of happiness, so happiness dwells with these people durably and predictably, and even when experiencing variations at what is going on in their lives; the test-retest validity, with happiness being an example, is also an example of how high test-retest validity can find particularly beneficial highly deterministic genes,

directly improving and contributing to finding and making enhanced genomes and optimized genomes.

It is also likely that highly divergent (90th percentile or higher of divergence) monozygotic twins at measured psychology traits (and physiology variables like heart disease risk factors) compared with other monozygotic twins of identical Sundet cycle year might have some additional non-Sundet cycle trait variability, with findable greater variability genes at their genomes, after finding those genes permanent epigenetics (RNA drug continuous production at the germline) can establish high like .99 heritability equationally additive (modulating of) the sundet effect; as an example susceptibility to heart disease might be predicted with creatinine, heart rhythm, and blood pressure, if the twins are highly divergent at the characteristics then it is likely the one with the heart disease markers will get heart disease, this heart disease might actually recede (a kind of prevention) when that twin's variability from their complement twin, who is well, is minimized, even if the unwell twin only travels towards a population median that is a large reduction in heart disease risk, so that is a way reducing sources of divergence (like other effects in addition to Sundet effects) and increasing health; This benefit also applies to the positive enhancements of an enhanced genome or optimized genome beyond what is described at this paragraph

Divergence in physiological. science of psychology and health parameters could also be measured along with psychology traits at these 90th percentile of most divergent monozygotic twins, and the gene(s) that cause phenotypic and psychological divergence, or possibly epigenetics can be characterized as genes so beneficial alternative genetics and epigenetics that cause Beneficial genetics to fully benefit homo sapiens, that is humans, that is people can be found. One technology to address making beneficial new genetics available to those with the deleterious phenotypic and psychological divergence gene(s) or epigenetics, such as those that cause the 99th percentile of genetic divergence among monozygotic twins is using epigenetics to repair and increase heritability, so RNA, similar to RNA drugs that

effect the heritability-of-many-traits-and-physicalities from the epigenetics of say, hypermethylation of those deleterious divergence (and perhaps regression to the mean) genes so they omit being active, or if less heritability of divergence genes is associated with gene activation when measured then acetylation (activation) beneficially reduces divergence; A technology to cause the heritability of psychological measures, traits and physicalities to increase (with data from among other sources, monozygotic twin non-divergence) is the genome being modified to produce RNA (iRNA) that functions the same as an iRNA drug that reprograms the epigenome to have patterns that minimize or even shut down activity at the genes that cause deleterious twin study divergence, putting the RNA (iRNA) that functions like an epigenetics modifying RNA drug causes high heritability, continuously causing the genetically advantaged and genetically optimized to live out, and physically be their advantages, including multiple complementary simultaneous longevity body chemical, genetic and epigenetic, and other technologies

They could also do research on monozygotic twins that were below the median for a beneficial trait, like **absence** of neuroticism, or below median on various nonpsychological medical measures (like fewer longevity increasing beneficial extra small cholesterols) , and then find out if **fully reversible** epigenetic drugs that shift the person's traits and physicalities away from heritability cause the measured deleterious physicality or trait to newly cluster around the median, rather than deleteriously further away from the median like it did before the fully reversible epigenetic therapy, if so, people who are physically ill might be more likely to physically recover from taking a genetic variance drug; I think it is more optimal to treat and cure disease and simultaneously install enhanced genetics and optimized genetics than revert unwell people to the middle of a normal distribution, placing people at the 99.9th percentile of benefit on the right side of the normal distribution is much more beneficial

A non gritty "grit" gene; beneficial perseverance; High

perseverance (95th percentile) persons who are also 95th percentile Light Triad score persons might be caused, or a lived-out tropism formed with fully reversible epigenetic modification, similarly there is a “grit” psychology test

Does the output of psychological tests, like tests of g (a measure of intelligence kind of like IQ) change if the people taking the test get a reward for every right answer; this might more accurately measure g at people that are: particularly spontaneous, “can’t be bothered”, “lazy”, veers away from challenge, insecure about the thing the psychology test is about, various big 5: neuroticism measures, and very creative people who can map more than one answer in their mind to be right; So if you pay people for every right answer does their g go up? And, if you pay people for every right answer does their test-retest reliability go up on tests that have right answers? Paying people to take intelligence tests (g, like IQ) is a possible way to reduce variability, facilitating finding g (like IQ) genetics

Are there any genes that are expressed only at the clitoris and penis, separately, it is possible;